

E
435
.F75

FLM
2015
021064

SPEECH

OF

HON. ^{Nathaniel} G. FOSTER,

OF

GEORGIA,

ON THE

PRESIDENTIAL ISSUES.

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

ON THE 9TH OF AUGUST, 1856.

WASHINGTON:
AMERICAN ORGAN, PRINT.,
AUGUST, 1856.

NATIONAL POLITICS.

The House, being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having under consideration the President's Annual Message, Saturday, 9th August, 1856—

Mr. FOSTER, of Georgia, said:

Mr. Chairman, that we are in the midst of perilous times, no one who opens his eyes to things around him will deny. Civil war in one of our Territories—strong feelings of hostility between sections of the Union—a great party marshalled under a sectional banner, claiming the whole North, and pressing the truth of that claim by every demonstration which comes to us from that quarter—a deep and settled purpose in the South never to submit to sectional rule, not evidenced by the rant of extreme men of that section, but made significant by the demonstrations of men who have always stood by the Union. This is an epitome of the state of things. Would I could give a more cheering picture. But truth requires me to sketch the likeness as the lines of light and shade fall upon the original, from the point at which I stand.

How shall these things be remedied? The skillful physician will always seek through all the symptoms of his patient for the cause of disease, before he risks a prescription; especially if he has a proper regard for the life of the subject. If we feel the same solicitude for the body politic, we, too, will look well to the cause of all our present ills, before we hurry to a remedy.

Did the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act produce these troubles? It is alleged that this act, containing, as it did, a clause for the repeal of the law of Congress known familiarly as the Missouri Compromise, did bring upon us the present unhappy state of things. It is my purpose on this occasion to examine the history of that act, and show that not the repeal of the Missouri line, but the *mode and manner* of that repeal, has done the mischief. Why should the simple repeal of that line excite the North to resistance, when it is well known that a large portion of those now arrayed against the South were always opposed to it as a compromise? It serves a very good pretext for agitation, but it is nothing but a pretext. We frequently hear the South appealed to, to resist every effort to restore that line, and the attempt is being made to induce the belief that such an effort will be made. Now, sir, I have no apprehension on that point. If there were no more serious difficulties before us than an effort to restore that line, I should have no fears for the safety of the Commonwealth. I speak what I conscientiously believe, when I now assert that, if the question of restoration were put to this House, under circumstances favoring its consummation beyond these walls, that not twenty-five votes could be recorded for its passage.

I know that upon an amendment offered to one of the bills before the House by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. DUNN,] proposing, among other things to restore that line, that a majority voted for it. I understand that game. It was very safe to make a point for home consumption, when there was no chance for the ultimate success of the measure. We are not to make up our conclusions from a single act, but from the line of action projected by a party. Do the Republicans propose to restore that line? Look to their platform, and you will find not even an intimation to that effect. No, sir, their game is not to repeal the Kansas-Nebraska act, but under the excitement incident upon that action of Congress, they intend to drive another great party of the country to the adoption of principles, as deductions from that legislation, which will give them more than a restoration can promise. They seek for wider scope for agitation, and new avenues through which to make their assaults more deadly upon the institutions of the South. How far they have succeeded, and are likely to succeed, will appear by looking to the action of the country for the past few years. I am going to speak freely of the Kansas-Nebraska legislation in the presence of my Democratic friends from the South. That it was denied all over the South that that bill contained anything akin to "squatter sovereignty," all must admit. If any man who advocated the Democratic side of the question had made the admission one year ago, in the South, that the Kansas bill recognized the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories, he could not have gathered a corporal's guard to muster under his banner. There has been great anxiety to ascertain what that bill did contain. It has been alleged all the while, that it was read one way at the South and another way at the North. I know that it was *believed* one way at the South, and *talked* another way at the North. This, so long as it remained a simple question of theory, gave little cause of concern. But, when a great party in this country, now in power in two of the co-ordinate departments of the government, and asking of the people an extension of their lease, saw proper, at the commencement of the present session of Congress, to adopt the Kansas bill, in terms, as the only rule of their faith and practice, it did behoove every voter, who intended to give his suffrage understandingly, to look well into the principles of that bill. I have, on a former occasion, alluded to this thing, and I then asked of my Democratic friends, that they would lay down *one* rule of action, not the Kansas bill, but the *principles* contained in that bill, as they understood them. And I hoped that, when they assembled in national convention, knowing as they did the charges that had been made against them of an

effort to mislead, they would have done themselves and the country justice in this matter. In this hope I have been disappointed. That convention met and adjourned, and when its proceedings came to the country, the oracle was as Delphic as before they met. I have sought through every channel that was open to me to solve the mystery, and will now proceed to give to the Committee and to the country the result of my labors. It appears from the declarations of some of the Southern supporters of the Democratic nominee, that there was a compromise made between the Kansas-Nebraska men North and South when that measure was to be adopted. What was that compromise? The men of the South denied that Congress had any power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories. The men of the North claimed that Congress did possess that power. Here was a difficulty that must be met. Shall the North or the South yield? Both sections claimed that they yielded no principle in this adjustment. Let us see. When the Kansas bill proposed to leave to the people of the Territories the right to form their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject to the Constitution of the United States, did it intend to express the idea that Congress had power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? We at the South say it did not. How do the men at the North regard it? Of course, if they yielded no principle in the arrangement, they *must* hold that the bill not only does contain the admission of that power, but was intended to contain that admission.

The bill in terms proposes to clothe the people of the Territories with the power—it assumes it *subject only to the Constitution of the United States*; and all, therefore, who hold that the power exists in Congress under the Constitution, must of necessity hold that the power was recognised in the bill. Did the men of the South who were parties to that arrangement of compromise know that the men of the North so understood it? As a matter of course they must have known it, for that formed the very gist of the compromise. A simple repeal of the Missouri restriction would have left both sections free to seek their rights under the Constitution; but this did not satisfy the North. If they agreed to the repeal on their side, the South must at least go through the *form* of recognising the power of Congress, and if they feared the thing would be too palpable, might throw in the verbiage “*SUBJECT ONLY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.*” That little addition could hurt nobody, especially those who claimed the power under the Constitution. And just here a very grave question arises—If the men of the South who were parties to the understanding voted for the measure with a full knowledge that the party North understood the bill to contain the recognition of the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, are they, or are they not bound by that act? In law this would not admit of a question. How far good faith and good morals require a fulfilment of the expectations of the North on this subject, I leave every one to determine for himself. But, if there had been any doubt upon the subject as to how the party at the North regarded this question, that doubt has been dissipated by the

developments of the last few months. I pass over the fact, that at Cincinnati the South was required to give up her preference for the nominee for the Presidency. Nor will I stop to discuss the platform of that Convention. It is sufficient on that subject, that resolutions in relation to internal improvement were passed, and violated before the ink that wrote them got dry. That a kind of bush-seine drag-net was hung on by way of making a clean sweep, tad-poles and all. But the only plank in the platform which attracted attention, or at least the one that was of absorbing interest—the ground and pillar of its support, was the Kansas Nebraska act. The principles of that bill, undefined it is true to the uninitiated, were still to be the landmarks of the Democratic, or rather *American Democratic* party.

How anxiously then did we look to the letter of acceptance of the nominee of that Convention. Will he illumine the darkness that hangs around that much-talked of measure, was felt by all and expressed by many? Well, the letter came and the mystery was revealed. Hear him!

“This legislation is founded upon principles, as ancient as free government itself, and in accordance with them, has simply declared **THAT THE PEOPLE OF A TERRITORY, LIKE THOSE OF A STATE, SHALL DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES, WHETHER SLAVERY SHALL OR SHALL NOT EXIST WITHIN THEIR LIMITS.**”

Is there any doubt now as to what the Kansas bill meant? “The people of a Territory, like those of a State, *shall* decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits.” Is this “squatter sovereignty?” No sir; it is much worse, as I shall now propose to show. The practical effects are the same, but the principle involved is vastly more dangerous to the South. “Squatter sovereignty,” as defined by those who were at its baptism, is the right claimed by intruders, or squatters in a Territory of the United States, to manage their own affairs, independent of Congress altogether. Those who hold this doctrine, are few in number, so far as they have developed. The distinguished Senator from Michigan, [GENERAL CASS] ranks as Godfather to the bantling, and I believe the gentleman from Tennessee, [MR. JONES not now in his seat,] thinks him a promising youth. At least he talked something in the first part of the session, about the “inherent rights” that went with the squatter into the Territory. Mr. Buchanan does not place the power of the people in a Territory like those in a State, upon any “inherent right” in the squatter, but draws it from the “legislation” of Congress. For the want of a name we may designate his, **CHARTER sovereignty.** And to get the power into the people of a Territory you perceive he must first recognise it in Congress.

If his letter of acceptance left any doubt on the subject (which to a candid mind it cannot) that letter taken in connexion with his letter known as the Sandford letter, puts the matter beyond all controversy.

Mr. WARNER, (interrupting.) I understand my colleague to say that, as he interprets Mr. Buchanan's letter of acceptance, he holds that the people of the Territories in their *legislative* capacity have the right to exclude slavery therefrom. Now

I wish to call his attention to the fact, that Mr. Buchanan says that the people of the Territory have the right, in the same manner as a State, to determine the question for themselves—at what time? Will my colleague say that that refers to the time while they are acting in a legislative capacity, or to the time when they meet in convention to frame a State constitution? As I interpret it, it means that it is when they meet in convention for the purpose of framing a State constitution that they have the right, in the same manner as a State?

Mr. HARRIS, of Alabama. My honorable friend will permit me to interrogate him one moment. I presume he has before him the letter of Mr. Buchanan's, called the Sandford letter, to which he has alluded. If so, I ask him to look at it and say if Mr. Buchanan does not there expressly lay down the proposition that the people have the right to decide the question of slavery at the period of time when they come to frame their constitution?

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer both the gentlemen. My colleague over the way [Mr. WARNER] asks at what time it is. I understood Mr. Buchanan in his letter of acceptance to hold that the people of a Territory have the right to admit or exclude domestic slavery. I did not suppose, as I have already said, there could be any doubt left. Mr. Van Buren, his commentator, does not think it admits of doubt or cavil. He says:

"From these terms it is too clear to admit of doubt or cavil, that it was the intention of Congress to clothe the people of the territories with ample power to exclude slavery from within their respective limits, as well while they continued Territories as in making provisions for its exclusion from the State when that transition shall take place."

Has Mr. Buchanan or any of his friends ever repudiated that letter? On the contrary has it not been heralded forth, even from the Southern Democratic press as a "patriotic letter?" My friend from Alabama, [Mr. HARRIS] says that in the Sandford letter it is at the time they come to form a State constitution that they may admit or exclude slavery. I said before that the two letters together made up the case beyond cavil. So far from denying I am attempting to establish, by incontestable evidence, that Mr. Buchanan holds the doctrine that Congress, and not the people of the Territory, have the power over the subject. While the power remains in Congress, of course it is not with the people, for it cannot be in both places at one and the same time. The great question for the South in this matter is, has Congress the power? This is the hinge on which turns the whole thing, and it is that I am now trying to impress upon my Southern friends.

Mr. WRIGHT, of Tennessee. As the gentleman from Georgia is arguing the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, I should like to know what is Mr. Fillmore's position upon that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that presently. Let us finish the job we are upon, before we enter upon another.

Mr. WARNER. I do not desire to embarrass my colleague at all. I have the kindest feelings for him, but I desire to ask him if he does not hold that the people of a Territory have the power,

when they come to form a State constitution, to decide whether there shall or shall not be slavery there?

Mr. FOSTER. Most assuredly I do. My colleague is too good a lawyer not to understand the position I am pressing. The Kansas-Nebraska bill proposes, by its terms, to transfer the power, by Congress, to the people of the Territories. My colleague [Mr. STROMENS] not now in his seat has been asked the question more than once during the present session of Congress, whether the power to legislate upon domestic slavery had been transferred by Congress, in the Kansas bill, to the people of that Territory? His answer has been frank and explicit. If Congress had the power, the people of Kansas has got it—Congress could only grant what power it had. This is, in substance, his answer; I have not his language before me. He stated, at the same time, that he, as an individual, did not believe that Congress had the power; but, if the people of the Territory exercised that power, he stood ready to acquiesce. Now, that Mr. Buchanan holds that Congress possesses the power, under the Constitution, I repeat, is too manifest to be questioned by anybody. In his Sandford letter he says so, most emphatically.

I do not wonder at all that my Southern Democratic friends are a little restless upon this subject. They feel the force of the position I have taken—that Mr. Buchanan, with his declared opinion as to the power of Congress, must hold that the people are to determine the question for themselves while in a Territorial state. And they can but feel the disagreeable position they are driven into by their support of Mr. Buchanan. If they take him at all, they must take him *cum onere*. They must admit, in the very act of their support, that Congress has power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories, and, having that power, have already transferred it to the people of Kansas and Nebraska.

Mr. HOUSTON. Has the gentleman a copy of Mr. Buchanan's letter?

Mr. FOSTER. I have got it mixed with my papers, and cannot put my hand on it at this moment; but it shall be published correctly.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman state his language on the subject?

Mr. FOSTER. I will not undertake to state his precise words, but I can state near enough for our present purpose. He had been represented as holding to the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." He repelled that idea, and, as a conclusive proof that he could not so hold with consistency, said he held that Congress had a *sovereign* power on the subject, which, from its nature, must be *exclusive*.

But, to save the gentleman from any apprehension of unfairness on that subject, I again assure him that when I have my speech printed the letter shall be inserted, and permitted to speak for itself:

WASHINGTON, August 21, 1846,

DEAR SIR: I have just received yours of the 12th instant, in which you submit to me the following paragraph, and ask whether it contains an accurate version of the conversation between us, concerning my Berks county letter, on the occasion to which you refer:

"Happening to meet Mr. Buchanan at the President's levee, on Friday evening, I called his attention to this letter, and asked him if he intended to be un-

derstood as claiming that the population of a Territory in an unorganized capacity had the right to control the question of slavery in such Territory. He declared that no such idea had ever been maintained by him; that the construction put upon his language by Mr. Yancey was a perversion of its plain and obvious meaning; that, in his opinion, the inhabitants of a Territory, as such, had no political rights, [although they possessed all the private rights of American citizens;] that they had no power whatever over the subject of slavery; and they could neither interdict nor establish it, except when assembled in convention to form a State constitution. He further authorized and requested me to make any public use of these declarations that I might think proper, to correct any impression which Mr. Yancey's construction of his language in the Berks letter might have made."

With the addition which I have inserted between brackets, this statement is substantially and almost literally correct, according to my recollection.

In my letter to Berks county of 25th August, 1847, I had said, "under the Missouri Compromise slavery was forever prohibited north of the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes, and south of this parallel the question was left to be decided by the people." What people? Undoubtedly the people of the Territory assembled in convention to form a State constitution and ask admission into the Union; and not the first adventurers or "first comers" who might happen to arrive in the Territory, assembled in public meeting. If a doubt on this subject could possibly exist, it is removed by the next succeeding sentence of my letter. I proceeded to state: "Congress, on the admission of Texas, adopted the same rule," etc. And what was this rule? "The Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States," approved March 1st, 1845, answers the question in the following words: "And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union, with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire. Such was the description of the people to whom I referred in my Berks county letter.

Any other construction of the letter would render it essentially inconsistent with itself. Having urged the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, the inference is irresistible that Congress, in my opinion, possesses the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories. What an absurdity would it then be, if, whilst asserting this sovereign power in Congress, which power from its nature must be exclusive, I should in the very same breath also claim this identical power "for the population of a Territory in an unorganized capacity?"

In conclusion, I desire to reiterate and reaffirm every sentiment contained in my Berks county letter. I cling to the Missouri Compromise with greater tenacity than ever, and yet firmly believe that it will be adopted by Congress.

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

T. SANDFORD, Esq.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Does he hold that Congress does or does not have the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories?

Mr. FOSTER. I hold that Congress has no such power.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does the gentleman hold that Congress has no power to legislate for the protection of slave property?

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will have a little patience, he shall have my views upon that subject in an unmistakable form.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman is trying to make a point on the fact that Mr. Buchanan, in his Sandford letter, according to the gentleman's version of it, admits the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories. Now, I presume, if the gentleman from Georgia will reflect for a moment, he will see that Congress has the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery to the extent of protecting and regulating that species of property. I understand Mr. Buchanan's position to be just that. Not that it has the power to abolish slavery there. We have no power to legislate slavery into a Territory or out of it. I would like the gentleman from Georgia to say whether he does not hold that doctrine? I want him to answer the question whether Congress has the power to legislate for the protection of slavery in the Territories?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want the gentleman to mar the proportions of the speech I am endeavoring to make, nor exhaust the time allotted me with his irrelevant matter. Has not Mr. Buchanan asserted "sovereign" and *exclusive* power in Congress over the whole subject of slavery in the Territories? And has it not been admitted, as I have already said, that if that power exists in Congress, then the people have it to *admit* or *exclude* slavery? Does not Mr. Van Buren show how and for what that power is to be used?

Mr. HOUSTON. I hope the gentleman will, before he attempts to play Yankee with me, answer the question I put to him. I will answer his questions, if he will give me the opportunity. But I insist that he shall not evade the question I put to him by asking another.

Mr. FOSTER. I'll answer the gentleman if he will only keep quiet. Does enforcing the principles of the Missouri Compromise line include only legislation for the protection of slave property? Is the Wilmot Proviso a measure for the protection of slave property in the Territories? If so, then Mr. Buchanan may only mean that Congress, with the "sovereign and exclusive" power over the subject, can only legislate for the *protection* of slave property. Whenever the people can be made to believe that, to drive out or set free slaves taken to a Territory, is legislation to protect slave property, they may be prepared to see Mr. Buchanan's position in the light in which the gentleman presents it.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I ask gentlemen to look at the fruits of this new doctrine. The Territories opened with the understanding at the North that the first-comers were to determine the character of their domestic institutions, with a strong determination in that quarter that no more territory should be appropriated to slave labor, and this begetting on the part of the South a counter-determination that they would not be thus driven from the common property of all, a collision ensued. The result is familiar to all; for every wind that has blown from Kansas since we have been in session has been laden with wars and rumors of wars.

Mr. OLIVER, of Missouri. What does the gentleman mean by wars and rumors of wars?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean that we have had a great many rumors of war in Kansas, whether they be true or not.

Mr. OLIVER. What does the gentleman mean for such which I have made allusion?

"Enter I mean this: If you open the door last there are two opposing interests, and say to the parties in interest, the first that gets the management of affairs shall determine the character of your domestic institutions, you may expect just such scenes to occur as have been reported to have occurred in Kansas.

Mr. OLIVER. Is that what you mean?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; that is what I mean.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well. Go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I repeat, what else could you expect from such a state of things? As I before remarked, in the arrangement of the Kansas bill, as understood by the North, no principle was abated on their part. They gave up no right to exclude slavery from the Territories. The question was not settled; it was only transferred. If while the question was kept here you had wais of words, what else could you look for when the same question was sent to the plains of Kansas to be settled by the greatest speed and the stoutest arm?

Now, if any man at the South supposes that anything was accomplished for his interest by the passage of the Kansas bill, with the Northern construction of it; or that there is any party at the North who do not desire to see Kansas a free State, he is laboring under a very great mistake. The feeling of the great body of the North is against us on the subject of slavery. And even the fair men there, who will stand by us upon the Constitution, had, nevertheless, rather see the Territories made into free than into slave States. They would use no unfair means to accomplish that object, but, at the same time, would avail themselves of the advantages which result from the doctrine we have been discussing. What, then, can the South expect from such a state of things? Will any sane man be willing to risk the tenure of his slave property in a Territory so situated as to make it doubtful as to which side will have the ascendancy, all the while subject to have it swept from him by an act of Territorial legislation? Of course, under such circumstances, no man would settle with his slaves and make improvements. The South must either surrender all doubtful territory, or hold it by force of arms.

Are not those men at the North who sustained the Kansas bill upon the ground that it was a good measure for freedom, in the right? It was charged that Mr. Pierce was in favor of making Kansas a free State, and I am not prepared to deny that charge. But was he not in sympathy with the large majority of the supporters of the bill at the North on this subject? I might multiply instances all over the North, if it were necessary to do so. Mr. Pierce's organ at Concord, N. H., held the following language:

"All the valuable land open to settlement is already 'staked out' and 'claimed,' and eternal decrees could not make freedom more certain.

"Nor is this the beginning and end of the chapter, though this might be thought enough by any reasonable man. It is now proclaimed by anti-Nebraska papers that, such is the rush of emigration in this direction that, like the too abundant rains which swell rivers, it will overflow its natural bounds, and, passing the immense territory of Texas, make two or three new free States out of soil which had been devo-

ted to slavery! German emigrants are universally anti-slavery men, both from principle and taste, being unable to endure contact with the colored race; and, already occupying the western part of Texas, they will unite with the emigrants from the North and West in organizing free States on the soil of slavery!

"Nor is this all, great and good as it is. *It is stated that Missouri is awakening to thoughts of freedom.* Slavery was never strong there, and is mainly confined to the rich bottom lands of the Mississippi, while the western portion of the State is almost exclusively occupied by free men. During the last few years, the number of slaves has been diminishing as things that were; and now, when the State shall be nearly surrounded by free States, and the escape of slaves become so easy, and when so large a portion of the people are opposed to it, both from interest and principle, it is thought by those well acquainted with the state of public feeling that slavery will give way to surrounding circumstances, and Missouri itself join the sisterhood of free States around her! *Should not such prospects satisfy the most zealous Abolitionist?* Should not the part only which is moral certainty create the most devout thanksgiving? Utah, New Mexico, Nebraska, the territory of a dozen future independent States, and Kansas, all sure to be free, besides two or three to be carved from Texas, and Missouri itself to be free! *Who could expect so much?* Who asks for more? The Abolitionists have harangued for freedom, preached for freedom, and, as they say, prayed for freedom over this vast territory. *Should they not thank Heaven and be content when they received what they asked?*

"Indeed, they now admit, almost without an exception, that such results have been secured by the Nebraska bill—*results grand, permanent, and glorious*—such as no single act of Congress has ever before secured."

Governor Wright, of Indiana, within a very short time, said it was the best kind of a Wilmot proviso. Now, these are from Kansas, Nebraska men at the North. I furnish them, not to prove that these men are unsound, but to show what their interpretation of the Kansas bill is; and to satisfy all those at the South who fear the restoration of the Missouri line, that their apprehensions are groundless. Why, I ask again, should they restore it? No, sir, as I said at the outset, the game of the Republican party is not to restore, but to drive the whole North to their construction of the Kansas act, and then, in the language of the New Hampshire Kansas editor, "overflow their natural bounds," &c. What is to be done if more territory should be added in the Southwest? Is this same war for the power to rule to be without end? Would the men of the South tamely submit to an avalanche from the North into Southern territory to pass laws in advance against slavery, so that it might never have a foothold there? Let men pause and reflect. To illustrate some of the difficulties this construction of the Kansas bill has thrown in our way, I will give you some of my own experience. I have urged at different times since I have been here, upon some of the more reasonable of the Republicans, the impropriety of their having, through aid societies and otherwise, attempted to take Kansas, whether or no, and thereby bring about the unhappy state of things in that Territory. They reply to this, that whatever may be thought of the policy of their extraordinary efforts to possess Kansas, that it was lawful, and that they had only complied with what they con-

sidered a kind of promise held out by those who pressed that measure upon Congress, and some of them Southern men at that, in their declarations that the North ought not to complain, that she had the most people, could emigrate with less difficulty than the men of the South, and, therefore, were bound to make Kansas a free State. They claim that they are only laboring for a full execution of the law, and in the spirit in which they were invited to do so. With the present received construction of that act, I confess it is not so easy to meet that argument.

Mr. HOUSTON. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman will be brief, as my time is very short.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would not interrupt the gentleman if he had not spoken of what has been said by Southern Democrats here on the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act. If he does not wish to have a reply to what he says, then he ought not to quote from papers and letters which he has not with him, and the exact purport of which he does not recollect.

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever paper or letter I have referred to in my speech I shall print with my published remarks, and this is a full answer to the gentleman. He need have no apprehension that anything will be concealed. I am merely making commentaries on what papers I refer to.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman's commentaries may be wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. If the text is right, the commentaries, if wrong, will hurt nobody.

Mr. HOUSTON. My question is this: The gentleman presents as an evidence of the fact that the Kansas-Nebraska bill was urged by Northern Democrats, as a measure of freedom, that they argued before the people of the North that, having a larger population, they could sooner settle up the Territory and make their regulations to suit themselves. Now, does the gentleman see, and will he not candidly acknowledge, that this is not an argument in favor of abolition—not in favor of slavery, but in favor of the justice of the principle embodied in the bill that the people of the Territory, those who go there to settle and make it their home, shall be perfectly free to frame their institutions in their own way? It is a measure of justice and not of abolition.

Mr. FOSTER. What I say is, that the construction of the Kansas bill, as held by Mr. Buchanan and his friends, that Congress, possessing the power, and having transferred it to the people of the Territory, that they may act now, while in a territorial character, upon their domestic institutions. I say it is the doctrine held by Mr. Buchanan and his friends upon this subject which has produced the unnatural hot growth in Kansas and brought all this trouble and gloomy apprehension upon the country.

Mr. WARNER. When my colleague says that Mr. Buchanan's friends hold that doctrine, he does not intend to include me?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly not. My colleague has not come out yet upon that question. I only refer to those who have come out.

Mr. WARNER. I have come out. I have declared my views to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not apprized of the fact, as I did not hear my colleague's speech.

But I have been asked what were Mr. Fillmore's views upon this question?

Well, sir, I think I can at least furnish such proof as ought to satisfy Democracy. It will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that at the opening of Congress, when we were endeavoring to elect a presiding officer for this House, and the South Americans were voting for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. H. M. FULLER,] that our Democratic friends became exceedingly unhappy at the prospect of our depravity. They said that Fillmore and his party were unsound on the negro question—not that Mr. Fillmore had done anything to forfeit the good opinion they had once had of him, but because the gentleman from Pennsylvania was his chosen organ, and that Fillmore and his friends must be judged by him. They made speeches, and wrote letters, and had the country in a perfect fever on the subject. Well, in due time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. H. M. FULLER] made up his record, and it has gone before the world; and I am perfectly willing that Mr. Fillmore shall be judged by that record. What does he say? He says:

"I would have preferred that the legislation of the 33d Congress had not been enacted, and that the people of all sections should have abided by the compromise of 1820, as a measure of repose, because, under the compromises of 1850, peace, quiet, and social harmony had been generally restored. It might have averted the unhappy difficulties existing in Kansas—would have saved the country the long scene of disorganization through which we have recently passed. I would have let the compromise of 1820 alone; and did not favor the repeal, because I believed its effect, upon the public mind of the country, would produce injury and mischief greater than any good it could possibly attain.

"Now that the repealing act has been passed, we have, as practical legislators, to meet the existing facts, and a different state of case. We are not called upon to abide by past legislation, but we are asked to legislate anew for the establishment of the restrictive clause, under the plea of a restoration of the *status quo* before the Kansas bill was passed. *That restoration is now impossible. To attempt it can only produce irritation, sectional alienation, and a disturbance of the public peace of the country.*

"Practically, so far as the extension of slavery is concerned, the South has gained nothing; the North has lost nothing by its repeal. It is conceded, I believe, by intelligent men of all sections familiar with the country, that neither the soil, or the climate, or the natural productions of the Territories thus thrown open, can offer any permanent inducement for slavery to enter there. The cotton planter, the sugar grower, and the rice producer, will not feel it his interest to leave his own warmer latitude, where, in the millions of acres of unoccupied territory, he has ample room for present as well as prospective expansion. The law of interest—the irrevocable law of nature—must operate there as everywhere. True, there is now a heated and angry controversy in the Territory of Kansas. The men of the border, in natural antagonism with aid societies elsewhere, have been stimulated to associated effort for the purpose of its establishment. Men may engage in, but will not continue, a struggle of unproductive labor. If this be true of Kansas, it cannot be less so of Nebraska. But whether slavery will go into Kansas or not—whether it will go into Nebraska or not—is a question I shall leave with the citizens who reside in

those Territories to determine for themselves, when they come to form their State constitution and apply for admission into the Union.

"Entertaining these views, on the 19th of December last I declared, in the House, that I would vote for the admission of Kansas with or without slavery.

* * * * *

"My declaration, in substance, was, that I would vote for the admission of States without reference to the question of slavery. What is the past history of the Government? Eighteen new States have been admitted—nine free, nine slave. It has thus been nine times solemnly affirmed, that it is no objection to the admission of a State that its constitution recognises slavery. It has been as often affirmed that it is no objection to the admission of a State that its constitution prohibits slavery."

Any squatter sovereignty there? Would the doctrine therein embraced applied to Kansas have produced any of the troubles which have come upon that Territory? No, sir—no! If in good faith all parties had understood that the Territories were the common property of all, held by the General Government as the common agent of all the parties concerned, with no power either in the government or in the people of the Territories, while in a territorial state, to establish or exclude slavery, the government the while as an impartial agent, seeing to it that my property in Georgia was as much to be protected in the Territory as the property of the man of Massachusetts; and when the requisite number of inhabitants were there to authorize the formation of a State constitution, preparatory to coming into the Union, the right of the *bona fide* citizens to either include or exclude slavery from their constitution, I say, Mr. Chairman, with such doctrine as that applied to Kansas, you would have heard of no difficulties there.

Immigration would have gone in the natural way. Men from all sections would have met there to settle the country, and build up its institutions. Their domestic policy would have been discussed in a spirit of conciliation, and the institutions would have been made to conform to the true interests of the people. It does not matter where they might have emigrated from; left free to act for themselves, with the lights of experience before them, they would, as the proper time rolled round, have acted for their own interests, independent of all extraneous influences. This is our doctrine, and was, as I understood it, the doctrine of the people whom I left, some five months ago, of all parties. But this is not all the testimony I have on this point, of Mr. Fillmore's soundness. I understand the Democratic National Committee have sent out thousands of the letters of Senators Pratt and Pearce of Maryland.

I suppose they will not object to being held to the doctrine that they shall not be allowed to impeach their own witnesses. Governor Pratt not only says Mr. Fillmore is sound, but that he has a sound party; and the only thing, it would seem, that alarms the Senator is, that the party is not large enough; but that it is good, as far as it goes, he bears testimony. The other point we will try and supply. Senator Pearce pays Mr. Fillmore one of the handsomest compliments he has had. He attributes his want of popularity at the North to his patriotic administration. Now, sir, after adopting these witnesses themselves, it does not lie in

their mouth to say one word against Mr. Fillmore. And yet there are speeches shipped off from here by the cart load, filled with all manner of abuse of that good man, and no doubt in many instances both the speeches and letters alluded to, sent under the same frank. I tell gentlemen, in all seriousness, that the people will soon be brought to the point that they will not believe anything they tell them.

Mr. Fillmore needs no endorser to commend him to the people of the country. He stands upon his own past administration as his platform, and holding the constitution so as to cover North and South, East and West, under its ample folds, he submits his claims to all who love their country better than party—all who have patriotism enough to look beyond the agitations of a section—beyond the spoils of office, to the best means of restoring the harmony of all sections without trenching on the peculiar rights of either. If ever there was a time when we should be willing to look beyond mere party triumph in the choice of a Chief Magistrate, in my judgment, it is now. No mere party President can bring peace at this time. It matters not which section elects, nor how good in himself the chosen one may be, if he comes into the Presidency by the votes mainly from one of the opposing sections of the Union, supported in Congress by the men of that section, he cannot administer the government so as to promote harmony. His enemies will see him wrong however right he may be, and his friends will be exacting, in the proportion in adverse ratio of the area of a Congressional district to the breadth of a whole Union. This is no time for sectional Presidents, unless we have made up our minds to give up the Union without another effort to make it worth preserving. And it is useless to disguise the fact that there is now the most imminent peril right in our pathway. Mr. Fillmore *has* served us in just such an emergency. He then had the courage and the patriotism to convert his robes of office into "robes of ice," and, forgetting all else, to steer the good ship to the haven of safety.

There are few men capable of doing just as he did. Others *may* do as well. Is this the time to make the experiment? Will he do again as he has done before? Yes, sir. I *know* just as well as it is possible to know before hand, what a man of honor, and truth, and integrity, and THE MOST EXALTED PATRIOTISM will do in the future; that his Administration now would be as acceptable to all sections as it was in 1850-'51-'52. His election would now restore peace to the country in one month, without the violation of any law or the infringement of the rights of any section.—And my firm conviction is, if we could read the hearts of men as does Omniscience, that Mr. Fillmore would be put into the Presidential chair by the acclamation of the people.

But I am to be told, "you can't elect Mr. Fillmore, and, therefore, you ought to vote for Mr. Buchanan." I have no patience left for such arguments as that.

How do I know "we can't elect him," till we try? We all know if his friends all vote for somebody else that he can't be elected.

I do not believe that any well-informed man will doubt but that, if all the men in the Union,

who really prefer Mr. Fillmore, were to vote for him, that he would be elected. Then, why this "chicken-hearted" course? Do *your* duty whatever others may do. But, sir, what do we gain if we vote for Mr. Buchanan and elect him? We shall not restore harmony by that act, as I have already shown. Shall we establish any great principle by electing him? Yes, sir, we shall establish that Congress has "SOVEREIGN AND EXCLUSIVE" power over the subject of slavery in the Territories. And further, that Congress having that power, transmitted it to the people, and that the first comers into any Territory may elect a Legislature and exclude slavery therefrom. This, I say, we establish beyond "doubt or cavil."

Now, sir, if the Democratic party had run Mr. Buchanan simply as Mr. Buchanan, though I never admired him as a politician, yet, in an emergency, to get all hands together at the South for the final struggle, bitter as the pill would have been I would have voted for him. I could have done that and compromised no principle, because he would then have been run without any declaration at all. Or if he were run simply upon the Cincinnati platform, Janus as it *was*, the South could have voted for him without sacrifice, because she could still have contended for her own meaning of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. And, sir, as an evidence that I was unwilling to throw so much as a straw in the way of any arrangement which promised any good to the country, and especially to the South, I did not open my mouth. My own people complained of my silence; but I had a duty to perform above party. I had no personal ambition to gratify. I was here, not by any seeking on my part, but, having taken the responsibility, it was my duty to *serve* not *gratify* my people. Well, Mr. Buchanan wrote his letter. He construed the only plank in the platform that attracted public attention. He gave the platform a voice, and it spoke to the nation. I waited to hear the language of rebuke from the South. I knew that party fetters were hard to break, but that the voice of that platform was strange music in Georgia. Well, sir, that rebuke did not come.

Faint gleams of lightning it is true, and subdued mutterings, but no thunder tones. Well, as soon as the Southern patient had gotten over the qualms of the first dose, and become prepared for almost any drug known to the political dispensatory, Mr. Van Buren takes him in hand. I have been at some loss to know exactly what trick the magician was up to—whether he intends to take revenge upon the South for her repudiation of him in 1840, by the less manly but more successful mode of secret poison, or really has ambition to see once more his name and blood "lord of the mansion," I am unable to divine. He speaks "to the record," and *almost* by authority, and puts the matter beyond "doubt or cavil."

I paused to see whether Mr. Buchanan would speak, or by his silence acquiesce in the commentary. He remained "silent as the grave." This was bad enough, but the cup ran over when, instead of that letter of Mr. Van Buren arousing the whole South to a sense of the quicksands into which they were being carried, the Democratic party actually grew giddy with delight. Let me give you one or two specimens. Here is one from

one of their journals of standing, and in good fellowship with the party in Georgia:

"Martin Van Buren and his son John are out for Buchanan. The former in a letter and the latter in a spicy speech reported in the New York papers. We believe this will secure New York to the Democratic ticket. The Van Burens have been leaders among the Soft Shell Democracy, and their support of the ticket augurs well for the union of the party in that State. In taking this step, they are compelled to back from their former position on the slavery question.—*Southern Banner*."

Back indeed! I said they were giddy. Charity requires us to believe that the editor wrote the article before he read the letter. Carrying New York for Democracy seemed to be the one idea that filled his mind. Right upon the heel of that another leading journal, at the capital of the State, endorses the letter as a "patriotic letter."

Why patriotic? Is it because he smells less of the Buffalo platform than he did in 1848? Hear him:

"My own course in regard to it (slavery in the Territories) has been one, by the record of which I shall always be willing to be judged, whenever and wherever the acts of an individual are deemed of sufficient importance to attract attention."

Patriotic! Why? Because he thinks Congress has no power to give the people of the Territories power to exclude slavery? Hear him again:

"I have not the slightest doubt of the power of Congress to give this authority to the people of the Territories."

Why, again I ask, is that letter thought to be patriotic by Southern Democracy? Is it because in illustrating a principle throughout his whole letter he uses the words *exclude* slavery every time, and *include* never? No, no, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Van Buren said he would vote for Mr. Buchanan—that was enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask how any Southern man can vote for Mr. Buchanan without committing himself to the power in Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories? What will be the effect of that? I want every Southern man to reflect upon this point. There is no obligation on the North not to transfer the question of power from the Territories back to the halls of Congress. If, in future years, we shall acquire more territory from Mexico, and the North, thinking the chance is better than in Congress than in the Territories; if they find that they cannot "overflow their natural boundaries" sufficiently to accomplish their purpose, and come back to Congress, to exclude slavery, how can any man who now supports Mr. Buchanan open his mouth against that claim? Now, do not get one side of this point. It is not because Mr. Buchanan believes in the power simply which binds you—IT IS BECAUSE HE MAKES THOSE OPINIONS YOUR PLATFORM, and you endorse it. You make the Kansas bill your platform—he puts words into the mouth of that measure, not what you think it ought to say, but you not only do not contradict that language, but endorse it by your vote. This answers all the appeals which have been made to me to come to the support of Mr. Buchanan. We are upon the eve of a great battle. What will be its result I cannot tell. But when the din shall have died away, and the smoke

cleared up, if the Union is left, I want at least to be left with free limbs and untrammelled tongue when the next battle is to be fought for the South. And I want it distinctly understood, that the chief to whom I do homage, must have other *aids-de-camp* than the Messrs. Van Buren. Why, sir, if Mr. Buchanan should be elected, and appoint Mr. Van Buren as Secretary of State, and send John Minister to England; no Southern man would have a right to open his mouth.

Mr. WRIGHT, of Mississippi. I would ask the gentleman from Georgia if, by any extraordinary contingency or mysterious dispensation of Providence, Mr. Fillmore should be elected, and should appoint Mr. Moore, who stood by Mr. Banks in the election for Speaker, or Mr. DUNN, or Mr. BAYARD CLARK, whether or not he would repudiate the American party?

Mr. FOSTER. Providence does sometimes interpose in mercy to save from the follies of men. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen seem to be slow to see a point. Now, I make no point on Mr. Buchanan, because unsound men vote for him. He is at liberty to get all the votes he can. I have not yet heard either of the gentlemen referred to pretend to speak for Mr. Fillmore, or to explain his position.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. DUNN is a Fillmore elector for Indiana.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not change the case at all. I say again, that I make no point on any man because he may get unsound men's votes. Nor would I, under some circumstances, condemn a man for appointing to office one who differed from him. I said you would have no right to complain if Mr. Van Buren were appointed. Now, the difference in the cases before us is, that Messrs. MOORE, DUNN, and CLARK, either differ or agree with Mr. Fillmore. If they differ with him, and he appoint them, his friends have a right to complain; but if he and they openly agree before the election, and he then appoint them, I for one will not complain. Now, Mr. Van Buren openly takes position with Mr. Buchanan—stands upon his platform—makes it say the same thing. Mr. Buchanan and his friends not only do not repudiate, but endorse, as I have shown. Why, then, should they find fault? Is not Mr. Van Buren in full fel-

lowship? Has he not written a "patriotic letter"? Will not he and John, at the head of the Softs, secure "New York to the Democrats?" Do they usually work in politics for fun? Will they not think the "laborer worthy of his hire" if they should "secure New York to the Democrats?" I think I was quite modest in the places I have assigned them. I should think a man of the calibre of either of them, with New York at his back, and in "full faith and practice" of Democracy, might well aspire to the first office in your gift. But my time is almost gone. How much have I Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN. Three minutes only.

Mr. FOSTER. I did want to examine a little to see what sort of a party at the North was to be built up by taking hold of the Democratic nominee. I have been told for years, sir, that the old Whig party North was rotten, and the Democracy sound. They said—"Just clear the track of old Federal, blue-light, abolition Whigs, and then stand still and see the salvation of the Democratic party." Well, the track was pretty well cleared, and what has been the result? By looking into the history of the thing a little, I find that in at least two or three States at the North, the "backbone" Democratic districts—districts which gave Mr. Pierce from 1,500 to 5,000 majorities, are now all represented by Republicans, with majorities at their backs of from three to seven thousand. And, what is a singular fact, I learn that in Ohio, the districts now claimed with most confidence by the Democracy, are some of the old Whig districts. But that is not all. The tune has changed. We hear no more of "old Federal, blue-light, abolition Whigs." And, in fact, I have not heard much very recently of "dark lantern." But now it is "GALLANT old Whig party"—"GLORIOUS old Whig party"—"PATRIOTIC AMERICANS"—and the cry has become almost Macedonian—"Come over and help us!" "Help!" help!!" "help!!!" "everybody run here." Why, what on earth is the matter? Is there any foreign enemy on our shores? Have Indians broke out?—"No, no, worse than that; there is mutiny in the Democratic camp. Come and help us manage our friends, or the country is lost." [Here the hammer fell.]

ADDENDA.

Mr. Foster's speech having overrun the eight pages into which it was proposed to compress it, and not filling up a pamphlet of sixteen pages, we have, with his approbation, concluded to insert a recent letter of Senator Houston of Texas, together with the resolutions of an

American meeting held at Greenville, Butler county, Alabama, on the 9th of this month, and the editorial comments of the *American Organ* thereupon, from the daily *Organ* of this date, 18th August, 1856.

Gen. Sam Houston on the Presidency.

WASHINGTON CITY, July 21, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 27th of June, ultimo, addressed to me at Huntsville, did not reach me until my arrival here. I thank you for your kind sentiments, and I assure you I reciprocate all you have expressed. Any apology was unnecessary for addressing me on political subjects, as they are now so interesting to the public as well as to individuals. I thank you for your views and suggestions, and will render mine with perfect freedom and fidelity. You say, in speaking of yourself, that "having been reared almost beneath the shades of the Hermitage, and in every sense a Democrat, I feel all the reverence and confidence in the principles and integrity of the motives that actuated General Jackson in his political course that I should do. The issues formerly dividing the old Whig and Democratic parties may no longer be said to exist, yet there is a difference in principle, arising out of the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, that must continue to exist as long as our present form of government continues."

Now let us reflect for a moment, and observe that I, too, if not reared "beneath the shades of the Hermitage," was taught under the pure, vigorous, and national Democratic teachings of the revered and brave old chief, whose wisdom brought honesty, purity, and vigor into the public service, with strength, love of union, honor, and renown to the whole country. I marched with that old chief, and kept step with his Democracy throughout his public life; and since he departed I have never deviated for a moment from his principles; and, I tell you, you can say most truly, that not only the issues formerly dividing the old Whig and Democratic parties, can no longer be said to have any practical existence, but that those parties themselves have no distinctive character.—They have faded, become extinct, and expired.

One, the Whig party lives only in the memory of its great name, its great abilities, and its great failures to accomplish practical results; the other, although it retains the name of Democracy, has no memories to which the present organization can refer without a blush of shame. The Democracy of to-day is a "compound" of heterogeneous materials; it has dwindled down to mere sectionalism, and is now but a faction. It has lost the principle of cohesion, and boasts no longer a uniform policy. When it followed with us the flag of the "old chief" it had a consistency of principle and firmness of purpose which always accompanies a clear conviction of right. It had clear heads, patriotic hearts, and clean hands ever ready in its support. It spoke wisdom and quiet at home, and every section rejoiced in our general prosperity; it announced its foreign policy, and negotiations abroad were no farther necessary than to communicate that announcement.

Where is that Democracy to-day? Swallowed up in unmitigated squatter sovereignty—in sectional bickerings and disputes—in disregarding compacts between the different sections of the Union, the repeal of which has led to insurrection in Kansas—in getting up Indian wars, wherever Indians could be found, as a pretext for increasing the regular army, the estimated expenses of which

at this time are \$12,000,000 per annum, when \$300,000 judiciously expended would secure peace with every Indian tribe on the continent, and induce them to embrace the arts of civilization.

The foreign policy of the present Democratic President has been far from creditable to our government. It, too, has shown a disposition to court an alien influence to sustain it, while it has declared and practised relentless proscription against native-born American citizens. I will pursue this point no further. To ruminate upon it is painful enough for a man who loves his country, but when called upon by friends, I feel it due to them to express my sentiments plainly. You and I, and tens of thousands of old Democrats who, were the true Covenanters under Jackson, wash our hands of these absurdities, follies, and evidences of culpable mismanagement.

None of these things are fraught with the principles of that Democracy which was taught at the Hermitage, and treasured up by us. I can find no relief in the nomination made at Cincinnati. I regard the gentleman upon whom it fell as a man of abilities, and one with whom I have always maintained kind personal relations; and for Mr. Buchanan I yet entertain the highest respect.—From his antecedents, I cannot regard him as more patriotic and national than Mr. Fillmore.—In the office of President, one has been tried, the other has not. It is matter of astonishment to me that the nomination happened to fall to the lot of Mr. Buchanan, when other names, as I have learned, were used on the occasion, who had been the active advocates of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which had been declared to be the main issue in the approaching Presidential contest. That plank is prominent in the platform, and the platform has been accepted, cordially, by the nominee. We have to regard squatter sovereignty as one of the cardinal points of modern Democracy. The candidate, however, has merged himself in the platform, or the principles of it, which, to my mind, are not in harmony with Jackson Democracy, and I accordingly repudiate them. I cannot separate the candidate and platform in this instance, as they are identical, inasmuch as the nominee has said that he could no longer speak for himself, as James Buchanan, but as the exponent of the principles set forth in the platform. I am constrained, according to my notions of Democracy, to utterly reject the platform, and cannot give my support to the nominee of the present Democratic party.

Of the Republicans, I can only say that their platform and principles are sectional, and I cannot conceive how any man loving this Union, devoted to its principles, can support a ticket fraught with such disastrous consequences to the whole country as its success would be. It has been my habit in life to deprecate and oppose everything of a sectional character, and therefore I cannot view with complacency anything which is calculated to militate against the Union, or any section of the whole country. You, my dear sir, know as well as I do, that when Texas was annexed to the United States she did not consider herself as identified with any particular section, but viewed herself as merged in the Union. She had received the sympathy of the citizens of every section of the Union. Her

feeling, her interest, and her existence in becoming a member of the Union, she considered as inseparable from its preservation and prosperity.

A sense of duty, under these circumstances, leads me to the conclusion to support the American nominees, Fillmore and Donelson. They are good men, and I think the only men now in nomination for the Presidency and Vice Presidency before the American people who do most assuredly claim the cordial support of men who are true-hearted Americans—Democrats and Whigs. All faithful naturalized citizens, though of foreign birth, who cannot be controlled by any foreign allegiance, can come forward to their support, as rational men, capable and willing to support the Constitution and the Union.

Major Donelson, you know, was brought up in the same school with ourselves, which was the old Jefferson and Jackson Democracy; and he has ever proved true to his Democratic education—the love of the Union being the polar star. Mr. Fillmore was a Whig, and served the people of his district while he was a Representative in Congress. His service was satisfactory, and he secured their confidence. When his official duties took a broader range, and new and responsible duties devolved upon him as the head of the nation, he cast aside every sectional and local bias; his views on all important questions were limited only by the extent of his duty to the whole country. His services met the acceptance of the nation, and he retired from office with the approving voice of thousands who had been his former opponents. In my opinion, he administered the government wisely and well. He found the country in great excitement, as well as dissatisfaction, and even in peril; and yet he left it in repose, tranquillity, and safety; and it is a pleasure for me to look back and remember that, without any deviation from my line of duty as a Jackson Democrat, I was enabled to sustain and aid him in most of his leading measures; and so, too, were nearly all the true-hearted Jackson Democrats of that time. Were the Democrats of the present day even as sound as they were then, though heresies had then been introduced into the party, I would cheerfully co-operate and act with them on many important subjects; but since they have recognised squatter sovereignty and their “great principle” (which I have been unable to discover) of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, as tests of true Democracy—making them the front banks of their party platform—I will not stand upon it, nor can I recognise such principles as truly Democratic. It was the attempt to carry out such measures which has involved us in our present calamitous and perilous situation. Hence the effort has been made to incorporate them with, and render them parts of, the ancient platform of the time-honored Democracy, supposing, as no doubt they did, that the talismanic name of Democracy would unite the American people in support of heresies as absurd as they are dangerous to the well-being of the country.

But, my dear sir, I will not attempt to go into detail further. I hope that Texas, when she comes to the polls in November next, will make a united rally for the American ticket, and that its triumph will be complete. I hope the friends of our Union and true Democratic principles will rally around

the sentiment of General Jackson, and show their reverence for his memory and great services to the nation, expressed in his letter to Dr. Coleman, “that it is time we should become a little more Americanized.” Since the day on which the warning was given, our country has been progressing; and from developments which have taken place, it seems to me that the exigencies of the country impress upon us the necessity of feeling fully alive to our nationality, by evincing respect for his wise counsel. I will not assume to offer to the people of Texas the words of warning and admonition. In the words of Jackson they have higher counsel. The days once were when my admonitions and advice were offered to them. They will remember what my course among them has ever been—they know with what intense interest I have sought to secure their peace and advance their prosperity. My devotion to them is not lessened at this moment—it can never abate so long as all I treasure upon earth remains in the bosom of that community. Whatever estimate they may think proper to place upon my opinions is with them. To the aged and the middle aged I would speak as to brethren—to the younger men and the youth I would speak as a father—and beseech them to take the course best calculated to restore harmony to our distracted country, and promote the general good.

Thine, truly,

SAM HOUSTON.

To Hon. JOHN HANCOCK, Austin, Texas.

American Meeting.

At a large and enthusiastic Fillmore and Donelson ratification meeting, held in Greenville on Saturday, the 9th day of August, 1856:

William Graydon, Esq., was called to the chair, and John B. Lewis and S. J. Bolling were appointed secretaries. Upon motion of W. H. Crenshaw the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

Whereas, Millard Fillmore and Andrew J. Donelson have been selected by the American party as candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

And whereas, we, a portion of the citizens of Butler county, fully impressed with the importance of this election deem it proper to give expression to our sentiments relative thereto.

Therefore, resolved, That we cordially approve the nomination of Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson, and will use all honorable means to promote their election.

Resolved, That in Millard Fillmore we have a candidate who once stood at the helm when the dark cloud of Free-soil fanaticism lowered over the political horizon, threatening the very existence of the Republic; then it was that the conservative, the national, and the patriotic of all parties quailed with fear, and dreaded the result; but the occasion proved Fillmore to be a statesman fitted for the emergency. Rising above all sectional prejudice, and with the Constitution as his guide, he steered the ship of State through the angry billows of sectional strife to the haven of safety and quiet; fanaticism was hushed into silence; a calm ensued; the Compromise measures were generally acqui-

esced in; and, at the expiration of his term, Mr. Fillmore retired from the Presidency leaving the country happy, contented and prosperous, and carrying with him the esteem and respect of the patriotic of all parties. Demagogues have again excited a sectional storm, until danger is as imminent as before. Who so suitable to lead us through the present crisis as the man who, when tried, proved himself so well qualified to fill the station, and was so acceptable to the people?

Resolved, That the rights of the South are plain, palpable, well defined and well understood, and we believe they should no longer be treated as open questions: we therefore deprecate the continued agitation of the slavery question as injurious to the South and dangerous to the Union.

Resolved, That the Territories of the United States are the common property of all the States alike and as such each State has the right to settle the same, and neither Congress, the Territorial Legislatures nor the people of the Territories, during their Territorial existence, have the right to exclude slaves or any other property from the same. Therefore we oppose the restoration of the Missouri Compromise and we equally oppose the more obnoxious doctrine of "squatter sovereignty."

Resolved, That the insidious doctrine now entertained by many distinguished politicians, both North and South, that the people of a Territory have the unrestrained right of self government to the extent of regulating their domestic relations and declaring what shall and what shall not be held as property, is alike dangerous to the rights of the South, incompatible with the equal rights of the States in the Territories, and, in the language of Mr. Calhoun, "the most monstrous doctrine ever advocated by an American statesman, worse than the Wilmot Proviso," therefore we can never support Mr. Buchanan, or any other man who contends that "the people of a Territory, like those of a State," shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits.

Resolved, That the presentation by a portion of the people of the North of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency exclusively upon sectional grounds, is proof conclusive that fanaticism is bent upon subverting the government. We therefore sincerely thank Mr. Fillmore for the manly efforts he has recently made at Albany, Rochester, and elsewhere, to stem the tide of sectional agitation in disregard of the rights of the South, for his bold patriotism in bearding the lion in his den, and awakening in the Northern mind a sense of brotherly love, and that he deserves the gratitude of the South, and should receive their support.

Resolved, That as members of the American party, we support Mr. Fillmore upon the declaration in his letter of acceptance, that he "approves its great leading principles as announced by the National Council at Philadelphia;" as old-line Whigs and conservative Democrats we support him upon his assurance, in the same letter of acceptance (and in sundry speeches in New York) that, if elected, his past administration shall be an exponent of his motto; and as national men we support him because he has been tried and found worthy to be the ruler of a great and free people.

Resolved, That we have the utmost confidence in the integrity and ability of A. J. Donelson as a statesman.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Montgomery Mail, Washington Organ and other papers friendly to the election of Fillmore and Donelson.

The following named gentlemen were appointed sub-electors for Butler County, to wit: Col. W. H. Crenshaw, I. J. McLemore, Esq., A. B. Scarborough, Hon. R. R. Wright, Dr. J. L. Nixon, William Graydon, Esq., Dr. Wm. A. Beasley and A. M. Read.

WM. GRAYDON, Chairman.

JOHN B. LEWIS, }
S. J. BOLLING, } Secretaries.

American Resolutions.

We publish to-day the resolutions of a large and enthusiastic meeting of "Americans," composed of original old-line Whigs and old-line Democrats, and held at Greenville, Alabama, on the 9th instant. The spirit manifested in these resolutions prevails generally throughout Alabama, and furnishes proof that "*Old Squatter Sovereign*" will be abandoned by the Democracy of Alabama, who are Democrats from principle, and not from party discipline, and who, when the party to which they have always heretofore attached themselves, abandons principle for the sake of the spoils, will abandon them.

The time has been, when the rank and file of the Democratic party simply inquired, "*who* are the nominees of our party?" That time has passed--the people are no longer in "leading strings"--and they now ask "*what* is the nominee of the Democratic party?" There is a wide difference in the meaning of these inquiries. If the question now were "*who* is the nominee of the Democratic party for the Presidency?" the answer would be an easy one--it is James Buchanan, of Wheatland, in the State of Pennsylvania--*alias* "Ten cents Jimmy," *alias* "Old Squatter Sovereign," and this answer would suffice.

But the question is now, "*What* is the Democratic candidate for the Presidency?" That is rather a difficult question to answer, in any brief space. *What* is the color of the chameleon? We look upon him, and he is not what he *was*: nor will he be long what he *now* is, to our vision. A *Federalist* of the days of that pure Democratic leader, James Madison, yet a Democrat of the days of Jackson--a tariff man in Pennsylvania, who could swear that "Polk

was a better tariff man than Clay," *but* a free-trade man in the Senate—a Wilmot-Proviso man, who claimed "sovereign and exclusive power in Congress over slavery in the Territories," in 1848, yet an advocate of "squatter sovereignty" in 1856—a thoroughgoing Missouri restrictionist only a few years since, and now a Kansas-Nebraskaite, up to the hub—an "old foggy" in all time past, *but* a filibustering, world-defying, war-threatening, Ostend-manifesto "Young American" now—an advocate of *low wages* in 1840, by reducing the standard of prices to that of continental Europe, (or *about ten cents a day*,) in order to "*cover the country with benefits*," *but now* forsooth, the poor man's friend, *because he wants his vote!*

Such *has* been, and such *is*, James Buchanan:—what he *will be* no man can predict, from his antecedents, but, if the people are themselves, wise, prudent and conservative, we can fairly predict *what he will not be*—to-wit, the President of the United States! The same determination to know *what* a candidate is, instead of being content to ask *who* he is, which is manifested in the resolutions to which we refer, prevails in the minds of the *thinking* people of the whole country. A change has been wrought in the people—they do *not now follow leaders*—but they lead the politicians and make them submit to their will.

Our government is rapidly becoming in practice, what it is in theory—the people are the *sovereigns*, and the representatives are their *servants*. To this change in the *actual* relations between the people and the politicians, therefore, must be attributed the conduct of such men as Pratt, Pearce, Johnson, Benjamin, Choate, Evans, Jones, Toombs, and a few other hitherto prominent Whigs and ambitious politicians, who have gone over "bag and baggage" to the sham Democracy, and now support for the Presidency the representative of *doctrines and measures* against which they have made war all their lives! The idea that "Fillmore has no chance" is a mere pretext to conceal their attempted revenge upon the American party.

We desire, by the repetition of this truth, to impress it deeply upon the minds of the people, that this American movement came from the people, and has, from first to last, been opposed by the trading politicians. The *foreign element* has been one of "batter and

sale" for twenty years past—the highest bidder always commanding this merchandise.—Hence, no politician, either Whig or Democrat, who looked to political advancement *dared to oppose foreignism*. Such politicians *frowned* upon the effort to create an American party—but the people themselves, nevertheless, raised up this party in defiance of the politicians.

This party has now become "a power in the State"—it has increased beyond all former examples in the history of parties—and it is destined to absorb the entire conservative elements which all other parties have contained. Nothing can prevent its final triumph. The old Whig leaders stand aghast! They cry out in the bitterness of anguish, "where shall we go?" They have been made powerless by the success of the American party; and what so natural—what so consistent with the spirit of *revenge*, as to join the standard of the *antagonist* of this party?

The American party has prostrated all their hopes of political advancement, unless indeed, the *sham* Democracy will reward them as recruits to its ranks! They look around them and behold amongst the present chieftains of modern Democracy, hundreds of men like themselves, who have been rewarded with power, place and preferment, for *similar acts of transfer*,—a *wink* is given—a *nod* returned—"all's right"—away these politicians go—and though, at first, they *swear* to adhere to their "old Whigs principles," as long as they live, *and a little longer*, a few years will find them "dyed in the wool Democrats" ready to make oath, and to furnish certificates, that they never supported a single Whig measure!

All these men will promptly become "*naturalized Democrats*," like those on that long list of names presented at the 28th and 29th pages of the "Madison" letters, who now control the politics of Virginia, and upon the very principles laid down and followed by the present administration, *to give office to naturalized foreigners in preference to natives*, these gentlemen will have a right to demand the highest posts of honor and trust, *provided* the *sham* Democracy shall defeat the conservative American party.

These are our views of the *true causes* why such prominent leading Whigs refuse to support Millard Fillmore, and we add, in conclusion, that in view of the circumstances in which they find themselves, it is not in our heart to speak harshly of them, but rather to commiserate them that their case is so desperate they are compelled to resort to so desperate a remedy.

CIRCULAR.

The undersigned, members of the *National Executive Committee of the American Party*, have pleasure in announcing to the people, that satisfactory arrangements for the future maintenance of the *AMERICAN ORGAN*, as an authoritative exponent and advocate of the principles of the *American Party*, have been completed.

Recommencing its labors, under these new auspices, the undersigned cheerfully commend the

AMERICAN ORGAN to the generous confidence of the *American Party*, in every section of the Confederacy, and they hope its columns may command the widest circulation.

HUMPHREY MARSHALL, of Ky.

SOLOMON G. HAVEN, of N. Y.

J. MORRISON HARRIS, of Md.

JACOB BROOM, Penn.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., May 15th, 1856.

PROSPECTUS OF THE AMERICAN ORGAN.

THE *American Organ* having been adopted, by the *Executive Committee* of the *American members of Congress*, as the *central organ* of the *American party*, the proprietor, with a view to its general and extensive circulation throughout the country, has determined, on consultation with his political friends, to furnish the same to subscribers, whose subscriptions are remitted *after May 1st, and during the months of May, June, and July*, on the following reduced terms, to wit:

Terms of the Daily American Organ.

Daily Organ, for one year	-	-	\$3 00		Daily Organ, for six months	-	-	\$2 50
---------------------------	---	---	--------	--	-----------------------------	---	---	--------

Terms of the Weekly American Organ.

Weekly Organ, for one year, to single subscribers	-	-	-	-	-	\$1 50		eight or more subscribers, each	-	-	\$1 25
Weekly Organ, for six months, to single subscribers	-	-	-	-	-	\$1 00		Weekly Organ, for six months, to clubs of eight or more subscribers, each	-	-	75
Weekly Organ, for one year, to clubs of	-	-	-	-	-	-		Weekly Organ, for the campaign, to wit: from July 1st to 15th November, each	-	-	50

All subscribers whose subscriptions have been remitted during the month of May, have been charged only at above rates.

D D 35

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2010

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN COLLECTIONS PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

JUL 70
ST. AUGUSTINE
FLA.



32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 897 883 3

